THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIV JUNE, 1961 No. 492

Editorial

WE cannot think why Bishop Cockin let himself be persuaded to abandon the title that he once intended to give his Pelican book, *God in Action: a study in the Holy Spirit*.[1] The title he had contemplated was "Safety Last", which is a good provoking title in itself and one that has plenty of overtones and undertones. It would of course be a most improper title for a book on politics or on the duties of civil government or of traffic controllers or of others who are responsible for maintaining the fabric of social order and raising the standards of social welfare. But now that there are so many agencies that are seeking to provide security for us all and so many pressures upon us to study "safety first" both for ourselves and for other people, it would be salutary if the thesis were propounded that it is the office of the Church to act as a counterpoise, and to nourish the sources of disturbing energy and of erratic experiment.

Good citizens should be law-abiding: it is necessary to know where they come from and where they are going, and they must stick to the rules of the road. Good churchmen should be born of the Spirit, and "the wind blows wherever it pleases, and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it comes from or where it is going. That is the way with everyone who owes his birth to the Spirit." Like Abraham they leave home without knowing where they are going. Might there not be a new doctrine of the relation between the State and the Church—or between citizenship and churchmanship—in terms of a polarity between "safety first" and "safety last"?

As things are, Churches seem to be as much geared in to study "safety first" as other institutions and perhaps, in so far as they are institutions, it is inevitable that they should be so. "The life of a Church is bound to be institutional," says Dr Cockin.[2] But would it occur to anybody to describe the Church portrayed in the New Testament as "an institution"? The Church in its spring-time had the character of a mission or a movement, of a ferment rather than of an establishment. It has never entirely lost this character, however heavily and elaborately it has become cabined and confined by institutionalism and the strait-jacket of rules and regulations. If its native character is to reassert itself, that is most likely to happen through a discovery of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, who has been strangely neglected by Christians during most of their history but who is nonetheless still at work in all sorts of places and experiences where he is not acknowledged by name. It was F. D.

[1] Penguin Books. 3s. 6d.

[2] "Forms and rules are of its essence", he adds—a more dubious proposition, which he qualifies later. See pp. 105 f., 164.

Maurice who said: "I cannot but think that the reformation in our day, which I expect is to be more deep and searching than that of the sixteenth century, will turn upon the Spirit's presence and life." Such a prophecy by itself can sound very vague or only verbal. It is the merit of Dr Cockin's book that he gives substance to it and shows how it might begin to be fulfilled.

He draws on his experience as a diocesan bishop, but he has always had an unusual capacity for seeing how things look and how things feel not only in the pew but from across the way. He is a Christian on the frontier. However, in this book he addresses himself primarily to churchmen, and asks them to compare and to contrast their condition, their outlook and their axioms with those of the apostolic Church. It is a terribly disconcerting self-examination that is called for, but it is one that could bring a great release whenever pressed to its conclusion. Dr Cockin would agree with Adrienne von Speyr that "the Spirit opens up new prospects daily, and reveals new possibilities to us. He is variety itself, imagination, the very inexhaustibleness of love. And that is why he cannot abide habit and custom, an unalterable framework. He is for ever opening up and stirring up the soul; he is the beginning and eternal youth."[1]

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs.—"On March 8th [1868] Canterbury witnessed for the first time in fifty years the striking and instructive ceremonial of an ordination. The Archbishop [Longley] resided for a week at the Deanery, and the candidates for the ministry, while under examination, were hospitably accommodated in the houses in the Cathedral precincts and at St Augustine's College; a room for the examination was supplied by the Deanery."—*Life of Dean Alford,* p. 411.

Christians and Nuclear Disarmament

The authors of this article are Alan Booth, Secretary of the Churches' Commission on International Affairs, David L. Edwards, Editor of the S.C.M. Press and Curate of St Martin-in-the-Fields, and Daniel Jenkins, General Secretary of the Christian Frontier Council and Minister of the King's Weigh House Church, London.

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, which some people thought at its inception was no more than a characteristic curiosity of British public life, has now shown itself to be a significant movement guiding and directing public opinion in this country and one which already has had political consequences. It has now undertaken, as a matter of policy, to direct its attention to the Christian churches in Britain and for this purpose has set up a special program with its own literature. It is greatly to be hoped that no responsible Christian will try any longer to persuade himself that this movement represents nothing more than the exuberance of a particular group of fanatics. We are all indebted to it for its skill in compelling the public to give its most serious atention to a problem so

[1] Adrienne von Speyr, *The Word,* pp. 67 f.

ugly and fearful that many people are tempted to shy away from it.

The great achievement of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, as we can now see it in a little retrospect, has been to break the ice of paralysis and terror which has gripped the minds of many people for far too long as they contemplate the destructive forces which have so suddenly been thrust into our hands. We have been tempted to take refuge in the thought that the problem is too vast and complex for us to take any serious part in its solution. A kind of fatalism has alternated with a vague hope that somehow statesmen will work their way out of present danger if given time to do it. The Campaign, particularly in its overtly Christian aspect, has asserted the Christian faith that men have no right and no necessity to allow themselves to become the slaves of their inventions but are required to take control of them courageously and bind them to the true service of mankind.

This, however, is not unfortunately the whole of the story. While we warmly welcome the energy and enthusiasm of those who are engaged in forcing the issue of responsible action in the nuclear age upon Christian attention, the problem itself is of such heavy significance to mankind that we cannot afford simply to be grateful for this initiative. We have to ask whether in raising the questions which the Campaign does raise so sharply, the answers are being commended which are most likely to ensure safety for mankind. We are all at one in a devout desire to find the means of warding off the threat of destruction which hangs over mankind, but this does not absolve us from the serious business of considering whether in this case we are following wise guides.

In the leaflet published by the C.N.D. and called *Questions and Answers for Christians on Nuclear Disarmament,* we read at the outset: "You might think from all you hear about it in Church that nuclear weapons had never been invented and that it is still possible to conduct a 'just war' against the infidel and to establish the Kingdom of God by force." This sentence gives us an important clue about what follows. It is clear, for instance, that the writers of the pamphlet are not aware how genuine and widespread has been Christian concern about the issues of peace and war in the atomic age, and how very few people there are who adhere to the propositions about establishing the Kingdom of God by force. Even more important, perhaps, is the evidence which the leaflet goes on to supply that the leaders of this campaign have not reckoned with the very substantial work which their fellow-Christians have been doing in this field over the past fifteen years. It began with the distinguished study under the leadership of Dr J. H. Oldham and under the sponsorship of the British Council of Churches, which issued its report under the title *The Era of Atomic Power.* Those who reread that document to-day are bound to judge that it showed extraordinary perception for the year 1948 and that it still has many things to say at least as worthy of attention as anything now being produced by the C.N.D. Thinking has, however, gone on since then, and the British Council of Churches has issued its newer booklets,

Christians and Atomic War and *The Valley of Decision*. The case to be answered by those initiating a new Christian approach is not whether they pay respect to this previous work but whether they show any signs of having taken it seriously themselves in reaching their own conclusions. Their leaflet, already referred to above, shows no signs of this, and one would like to believe that the reason is either oversight or an incapacity to grasp an unfamiliar argument. The disturbing fact is that there is ample evidence that all this material was well known to them but that the writers of the pamphlet refused to take it seriously.

This raises a particular difficulty for Christians. The Christian Church holds within its fellowship those who are pacifists and those who are not, and it has been one of the great achievements of the Church before and since the last war to insist that there was room in the Church for both groups. It is noteworthy that the work already done in this field has been done by men and women representing both sides of the pacifist argument and that great care has been taken to avoid caricaturing a position with which one does not agree. On the other hand, *Questions and Answers for Christians on Nuclear Disarmament* makes no bones about caricaturing the views of an opponent in order to make a point. The positions advanced in order to be demolished in favour of the policy of the C.N.D. represent in no serious way the questions and difficulties of those who disagree with the campaign. The result is that the universe of discourse explored in mutual respect and charity by pacifist and non-pacifist ever since the second world war is shattered from one side, in favour of indulging in a unilateral campaign of propaganda which shows no particular care to understand its opponents. This is in itself a blow to Christian fellowship. We must all try somehow to express our convictions forcibly, but without denigrating or misrepresenting the views of Christians with whom we differ.

Amongst the difficult questions thus conveniently avoided are the following. Does the possession of nuclear weapons effectively deter other people from using them? Would the disturbance of the present defence structures around N.A.T.O., which would follow any unilateral British action of the kind suggested, increase or decrease the danger that one or other of the two major powers might be tempted to have a go? If Britain were to contract out of a major place in the Western defence system, what are the chances of West Germany being promoted to take her place? What would happen if U.K. bases, influence, and conventional forces were removed? How would all this affect the prospects of arms control, disarmament, and other settlements?

The case which the C.N.D. pamphlet notably fails to meet can be briefly put thus. It is not the desire or intention of those who oppose the C.N.D. to use force, and particularly nuclear weapons, to set about defeating Russia or her allies. It is no monopoly of the C.N.D. to have discovered that mutual annihilation solves nothing. Our real problem is to find the course of action most likely to buy time for a more rational solution of the conflict. For the moment, the danger

arises, not from any deliberate courting of disaster, but from two possible sets of circumstances. One is that Russia might be tempted to probe a weak spot—as she did over Berlin, and in the Congo—to gain a marginal advantage, and in so doing find herself more deeply involved than she had anticipated. Then undertakings to others, the fear of a major humiliation, or simply rash judgment could precipitate a tragedy which no one had desired. The other set of circumstances would arise from the split-second factor in modern missile strategy. The possibility that if a fateful decision were delayed by a few minutes in order to verify evidence, it would be too late to do anything, puts both sides in a highly nervous state of mind.

Many people argue that relief for mankind from both these threats can be provided by a policy of working for a reasonably stable balance of power, such that Russia (and America and Britain too) comes to accept that probing is neither useful nor necessary, and other and less dangerous means of pursuing the conflict must be resorted to. This balance will not only not be served, but it will be dangerously and wantonly disturbed by any action of Britain which looks like crumbling the N.A.T.O. and other alliances. The penalty for doing so is not just that Britain might have to suffer occupation, but that the whole shaky structure of stability under which we now live might collapse and one side or the other might feel itself driven to desperation. Secondly, relief from the split-second danger can be foreseen when both sides have the kind of ultimate weapons which are no longer vulnerable to surprise attack. In this sense Polaris (and a Russian equivalent) can contribute to an easing of nervousness which will allow the temperature to drop and talking to begin.

To a Christian, deeply concerned that nuclear warfare should never happen, a program quite other than that of C.N.D. can equally make its appeal. Such a program would involve an improvement in conventional armaments in the West, such as would be capable of coping with all kinds of minor incidents without the (present) Western threat to initiate nuclear war. Such a force would need not only better weapons but greatly increased mobility. Are we ready to pay for it? Secondly, it would include a policy of closing the ranks of the Western alliance even more tightly, and for that purpose being prepared to surrender a measure of our national sovereignty. An ill-assorted, unco-ordinated and fragmented alliance not only squanders resources and duplicates effort, but is a standing temptation to an opponent to try to crack it. It is thus contributing too little to the stability on which peace rests. And any notion that it is Britain's role to provide the moral leadership by abandoning the heavy duties looks much more cynical across the water than it does on this island itself. Thirdly, while it is questionable how far Britain's *independent* deterrent contributes significantly to stability, Britain should be ready to give every facility to America to establish a form of ultimate deterrent which would be largely invulnerable to surprise attack, for in this way the hair-trigger would have a safety catch applied.

All of such stabilizing actions are designed to create the conditions of relaxed balance and stability in which it becomes possible to negotiate arrangements for arms control, settlements of disputes, agreed solutions and so forth. Some people in Britain believe that forces at work in the U.S.A. do not sufficiently relish that prospect. But to whatever extent that may be so, and if Britain is considered to have a wiser head on her shoulders (whether because her position is more precarious or because she has learnt something through history), then the case is made for Britain to continue to use what influence she can exert as a member of the alliance. No evidence has been produced to show that if Britain adopted the military posture of the Irish Republic she would have very much more weight in Washington than Ireland at present has. It is indeed a relaxing position to be in, but not for that reason more Christian.

Some of the above argument is hinted at and characteristically brushed aside in the answer to question ten of the C.N.D. pamphlet. This answer reveals that the position now being taken up by Christian groups within the C.N.D. is simply the old position of complete pacifism for which new arguments are sought in the nuclear era. It would therefore perhaps be more honest to make clear at the outset that in this respect the C.N.D. is not simply standing for nuclear disarmament, but for *total* disarmament and pacifism. It would be wearisome to rehearse once again the two sides of the pacifist, non-pacifist argument, but it is by no means clear that the Christian groups in the C.N.D. have advanced the argument itself in any new or fresh way. They have simply repeated it without facing the real difficulties that many Christians have had all the time in making it acceptable to themselves. Either we are to have a defence policy or we are not. Whichever line we take, this involves large-scale adjustments of present attitudes and a great deal of thought. These seem inescapable to any Christian who feels sufficiently strongly to address his fellow-Christians on this subject.

The pamphlet rejects the case for an increase of conventional weapons on the grounds that to play with the idea of any kind of defensive system opens the door to the possibility that little wars would quickly develop into nuclear ones. We must work to establish a "just peace" rather than prepare for a "just war". But it is in the eyes of many of us false to pose the alternative thus. Of course a just peace is everyone's overriding and urgent objective, but how to secure it? There is great weight in the argument that the establishing of areas of real military stalemate at certain critical points round the world is a service we render to peace, because it provides just those conditions in which it becomes both possible and attractive to the great powers to begin talking to each other about arms control and disarmament, and the settlement by negotiation of outstanding conflicts. The aim should be to establish such a position of stalemate in the safest way possible—that is, with the minimum reliance on nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, if Britain were to adopt a policy of unilateral nuclear disarmament, she would be bound to withdraw her forces

from N.A.T.O., which at present cannot present a defence wholly free from dependence on some kinds of nuclear arms. The effect would be to rock the boat for years to come, to undermine whatever precarious stability now exists, and thus to destroy the very conditions in which negotiations can begin calmly between the main powers with a view to reducing danger—in effect, to forfeit present political possibilities of moving towards a just peace. To do this just at the moment when there is evidence of a new desire in both the Great Powers to explore the possibility of moving from stalemate to negotiation would seem to many of us irresponsible sabotage of the cause of peace.

But the real issue goes deeper than this. After the great demonstration of Easter 1961 we ask: Is the C.N.D. going to prove itself to be no more than yet another radical protest movement in British life which makes the headlines but which makes very little else except confusion of mind? It is easy to create a great stir by producing an over-simplified formula for solving problems of universal concern and to give the idealistic young an illusion of activity by inviting them to go on mildly adventurous marches. But, at some point, the melodramatic gestures have to end and the hard thinking has to begin. Too few Christians are engaged upon that hard thought at present, and those of us who have made a few fumbling attempts at it covet the help which many members of the C.N.D. can give us. The issues are so complex and so important that anyone who has thought seriously about these matters will have little confidence that any conclusions about action which have been reached are necessarily right and he will welcome any suggestions, however radical, which might lead to more effective action. What he has a right to demand is that anyone who presumes to address his fellow-Christians on this matter should give evidence of having weighed the probable consequences of the course of action he recommends, and show himself more interested in trying to prevent the bombs falling than in defining a personal attitude which demonstrates him to be a man of enlightened sentiments and proper feeling. We believe that the will of the Christ who identified himself with men in their sin and need is not so much that we should take care to have clean hands when the world is blown up as to prevent the world from being blown up. We also believe that there are plenty of things which all Christians can do together now, even about defence policy, where plenty of effort is needed to change prevailing attitudes. Is it too much to hope that we can reach a common mind on these matters, emphasizing our agreements and keeping our disagreements in due proportion, so that we spend our energy, not on attacking each other, but in really working for the removal of the threat of nuclear warfare?

We are very glad to note that some leaders of the C.N.D. have arranged a private conference with some Christians of other views, to meet this September, and we hope that this conference will be part of a growing volume of sober and realistic discussion. To this end, we have sought to clarify our own position.

Religion and Road Safety—I

At the beginning of this year the General Secretary of the British Council of Churches sent a circular letter to the clergy and ministers of all its member denominations asking their co-operation in the Road Safety Campaign, 1961, of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents. The Council, together with the Roman Catholic Church and the Jewish community, is represented on the planning committee of the campaign, which has the special commendation not only of the Archbishop of Canterbury but also of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the Chief Rabbi. A service of dedication in St Paul's Cathedral followed its launching in April, and Sunday 25th June has been put forward as a day upon which religious bodies are asked to devote special attention to the subject of safety on the roads. In the face of increased road casualties during 1960 this must command appropriate respect. The official figures are: 6,970 killed, including 747 children; 84,443 seriously injured, including 11,857 children; 256,138 slightly injured, including 41,063 children. But what exactly are we in a position to do about it from the Christian point of view? A mere extension of the familiar exhortations to the general public to behave itself better, which seem to have such extremely limited effect, does not promise a great deal in practice. No doubt there will be plenty of sceptics to say the solution lies less in piety than with the secular authorities whose business it is to improve the roads and apply suitable regulations to them. Is this not a sphere in which the Church is almost bound to be ineffectual? Have we, in short, any particular approach of our own towards these problems of human behaviour in machines?

The address given by Lord Justice Devlin to the Magistrates' Association last year provides food for thought. Offending motorists, he declared, should not be divided into the careless and the dangerous, but into the errant and the wicked. Trial by jury and the penalty of imprisonment should apply only to the latter, since for the bad driving of the distracted, the forgetful or the inattentive, dangerous though it be, a jury is not a suitable tribunal, but for "sinful or disgraceful crime" it is an excellent one. Dangerous driving, he said, need not be deliberate or indeed involve any state of mind at all; the driver could be in a state of automatism. The law should have as a primary object the removal of motor-cars altogether from the hands of such as these, whose conduct reveals they cannot be trusted with the management of such potentially dangerous instruments.

The moral problem implicit in the situation, however—to which Lady Wootton of Abinger has also tried to draw public attention—it is commonly found most convenient to ignore, since the concept of sin is largely out of fashion nowadays and to suggest that anyone was a *sinful* driver would in general merely provoke amusement. Yet that is precisely what we all are from time to time. What is it that happens to many an ordinary, quiet, good-natured husband and father, for instance, which often so oddly debases him when he

takes charge of a motor-car in, say, the rush-hour? On foot on a crowded pavement he may be continually jostled without exhibiting much irritation, he will wait patiently in queues and show courtesy to women; but, driving, he turns to cursing anyone who gets in his way, feels that pedestrians and cyclists are provocative menaces, finds it degrading to be overtaken, adopts a dangerously competitive attitude to other cars and expatiates upon the inferiority of women. What motorist has not experienced something of this unhappy transformation, if only occasionally? Again, how strangely the appraisal of their personal competence by normally objective people is affected in this regard. When does one ever hear anyone admit to being a thoroughly bad driver? People have few inhibitions generally about other inadequacies. "I have always been hopeless at games," they will say lightly; or "I'm no handyman, you know—useless with tools". Even in relation to the vehicle itself it is not uncommon to hear, for example, "I haven't the faintest idea what goes on under the bonnet—don't lift it on principle". But never, "Frankly, I'm a dreadful driver. I haven't the temperament for it. That's why I always go so slowly and carefully and hesitate to offer lifts." The motoring organizations themselves are hesitant to try to inculcate the finer points of road behaviour in their members because motorists are known to be so curiously sensitive about any criticism of their driving. It was correspondingly interesting to find, in a discussion in a leading motoring magazine of the characteristics of advanced driving skill, the headline "Humility the Keynote", followed by observations to the effect that first-class drivers were given to continual searching examination of their own performance, with devoted striving to do better. It could almost have been an extract from a manual on the spiritual life.

What is quite evident, if unpalatable to accept, is that there is a strong inclination, in driving a motor-car, to revert to a more primitive level of personality. An extreme example of this was the trial of a lorry driver for manslaughter after he had deliberately rammed a private car and killed the occupants because he said he was sick of being dazzled by other people's headlights and swore to eliminate the next that bothered him. The *camionneurs* of France have an ill reputation for savage behaviour of this kind. The fact is that handling a motor vehicle, particularly under difficult or inherently dangerous conditions, or at speed, is not an intellectual or ratiocinative employment. The higher levels of our cerebral attainment must for this purpose be held in abeyance. It is impossible to carry on an involved and reasoned argument and to drive well at the same time (though no doubt the attempt is sometimes made), because the concentration of mental energy upon either function entails its considerable deflection from the other. Actually, limited intellectual capacity is needed for satisfactory driving, and American social psychologists found that the safest long-distance transport drivers were often rather unintelligent, unemotional types of fairly robust physique. Marked intellectual or artistic endowments are more likely to be a hindrance than a help in this quarter, and re-

quire to be held firmly in control by a strong, stable personality if driving excellence is to go with them. The normal psycho-physiological balance is altered in operating a fast-moving machine in this way, the demands made upon the human organism being primarily of a diffused sensory character eliciting carefully trained but now largely automatic patterns of response. Analytic intelligence will assist in the building up and integration of these in the first place, but interference with them in action subsequently can precipitate perilous confusion. Narrowed concentration on the task in hand becomes essential. The eye flickers appraisingly over a miscellanea of external vehicles, people, signals and signs, taking account of things in the peripheral vision also, interpreting the car mirrors and the dials within, and a diversity of lights, steady or flickering, without—traffic lights, brake lights, winking indicators and pedestrian crossing beacons, different kinds of street lighting (with a multitude of reflections to complicate them if it is wet)—together with sudden unpredictable situations of possible emergency on either hand. At the same time the driver is manipulating the controls of his own machine with both hands and feet, in integrated patterns of complex muscular co-ordination and with his auditory attention also engaged with engine sounds, horn notes and what not. The capacity of the body to assimilate and decipher so many stimuli and act appropriately upon them, for the most part upon a subliminal level of consciousness, is truly astonishing. Indeed, as the excellent booklet, *Priority for Road Safety*, published by the British Council of Churches, comments: "Circumstances have come into being which demand higher levels of skill and alertness than human beings, of all ages and types, can maintain all the time."

In this predicament the normal censorship of restraints, conventions and courtesies is at a disadvantage and an unusual ethical position results. Conscious reasoning is little involved, the mind is not in its usual control of the other faculties and there is a reversion to a more purely emotional level of response to the situation. This is why spurts of egotistical irritation and competition are apt to be exaggerated. The tendency is to regress to atavistic and even magical levels of the group unconscious. Hence the steady sale of medals of St Christopher, frequently to those having no obvious links with the Church, carrying the standard inscription, "Behold St Christopher and go your way in safety". The French social psychologist Michel Roche found that 90 per cent of the sample drivers he investigated touched wood when asked if they had been involved in accidents. This very retreat to a more primitive and instinctive condition may well constitute an unrecognized part of the attraction of controlling a motor-car, for many people. The sin of Lord Justice Devlin's classification is considerably Original. It explains, perhaps, how the motor-car can act catalytically as a superficial indicator of personality (significantly enough the accessory manufacturers describe many of the pointless embellishments they produce as "personalizers"—chromium portholes, stars and false twin-exhausts; toy tigers for the rear shelf, whose eyes light up when the brakes go on,

dangling dollies and even animated skeletons). Quite apart from its obvious use as a prestige-possession, in the modern jargon—in America the size and opulence of the vehicle is expected to match attainment even in ecclesiastical hierarchies—it tends to reveal prevailing dispositions of character in a broad way. The aspiring business executive who intends to let no one stand in his way is likely to follow a similar technique on the road. The pushing, the self-opinionated, the brash, the parvenu are more than liable, with inhibitions still further relaxed under the influence of the machine, to exhibit their natural tendencies yet more evidently in handling a motor-car. The ruthless, the cowardly, and the undisciplined drive on after accidents, encouraging themselves with specious excuses; the emotionally immature or frustrated of all ages use their machinery for compensatory satisfactions. American and Canadian sociologists found the most accident-prone drivers frequently came from broken homes or an unhappy childhood. Inadequate affection or neglect during early life, divorced parents and the like, appear to foster dangerous drivers. Emotional stress at any time is clearly reflected, too; and early adulthood between the ages of 20 and 24 showed a peak of proneness to accident. The unpractical, the careless, the muddler will tend to be distinctly so in relation to a motor-car, content to propel a dangerously under-serviced vehicle with ill-adjusted lights, instruments that no longer work, and, as like as not, a miscellaneous collection of refuse down behind the back seat squab. In Russia such inadequacies are frowned on and one is summarily fined by the police for being in charge of a dirty car.

Investigators have also marked the increased emphasis of national temperament on driving characteristics. For instance, the Italian tendency to cut a dash (*far figura*) leads to the almost invariable removal of silencers from all vehicles there, including the ubiquitous *sputnikare* (motor-scooters), so that they will sound like racing cars; and quite ordinary men with ordinary motors make a practice of changing their shoes for a thin-soled motor-racing kind, and putting on string-backed gloves, whatever the temperature, in order to drive to work. This reversion to adolescence, say the psychologists, is linked to the national obsession with sex, and nurtures an illusion of irresistible masculinity. Small engines are mercilessly overdriven; city driving tends to have the jostling audacity of the race-track, without its standards of competence; and the resulting cacophony is notorious. The Latin American approach is said to be influenced by the fatalistic Spanish acceptance of suffering and death, and drivers are apt to behave like matadors, risking slaughter by a calculated hairsbreadth, unscrupulous but skilful, so that traffic in Rio has been described as "rolling jungle warfare". The Germans in cars are in general vastly law-abiding and efficient, but some use their *autobahnen* as a means of relaxing from the national intensity of conformity and order. The motor-car then takes on something of the function of a psychiatric drug, and the over-tense subject deliberately makes for the motorway and releases his higher cerebral stresses by driving like a Valkyrie. Unfortunately the hypnotic effect

of the performance can become unduly soporific and the normally highly disciplined driver occasionally hurtles into Valhalla across the middle barrier.

The deleterious influence on driving of alcohol even in modest amounts is also evident in this context. The essential purpose of its use at any time is to inhibit the demands and stresses of the higher faculties and encourage a more emotional outlook, preferably of bogus well-being. This, however, is calculated to push still further the action the motor-car already has, but with the additional hazard that it works at the same time on the lower levels of the brain and slows up reflex responses and reaction times. It is only with the latter that police tests to estimate the alcoholic condition of offenders can concern themselves; but from the more general point of view the combined effects ought not to be overlooked, whether the subject is actually inebriated or not, and the matter of mere quantity is but a part of the total question. The sheer humbug talked about this—assisted by the obvious commercial interests—is astonishing. It is not a matter of personal opinion but of straightforward scientific investigation, such as that undertaken at Manchester University, published in the *British Medical Journal* of 21st June 1958, and supported by continued research since. The tests were made with carefully chosen bus drivers of long, accident free, experience—some of the most responsible drivers available. The results lay marked emphasis on the effects of very small doses of alcohol. The trustworthiness of a man's judgment of his driving skill was impaired after drinking less than one pint of beer and thereafter progressively deteriorated as more alcohol was consumed. At the same time every driver's tendency to overrate his ability in relation to his performance was as steadily intensified—and that among an élite of drivers. There was no evidence of any threshold. Instead there is a measurable increase in mean error as soon as there is a measurable quantity of alcohol in the blood, and, the scientists said, "Age, sex, previous driving experience and previous drinking habits . . . showed no relation to individual differences in response to alcohol." So a confirmed toper taking one pint of beer shows as much deterioration of basic physiological performance at the wheel as a teenager unaccustomed to drink would do, and the police now estimate that fully half the accident deaths after 10 p.m. are due to the effects of alcohol on drivers or pedestrians.

Moreover, the Economic Commission for Europe announced in January of this year that, of at least 60,000 people killed on the roads of Europe each year and well over 200,000 injured, not less than a third of these accidents are caused by "a lessening of attention because of alcohol". Recent research also reveals that, with some persons, the combination of small amounts of alcohol and the milder drugs now widely used, such as tranquillizers and even aspirin, so greatly augments the action of either singly as to prove in some cases incapacitating. Seeing that very many of us go to occasional cocktail parties, wedding receptions and the like, take wines with dinner from time to time, or a modest glass with friends, and,

further, that the medical profession expresses concern at the excessive use of drugs in these days, what is our responsibility in this serious situation, *as Christians*?

JOHN H. L. WATERSON.

(*To be concluded.*)

Revised Reviews: VI—John Oman's The Natural and the Supernatural

THE form of Cambridge Theology in the early 19th century was still dominated by the work of William Paley. Natural Theology was the knowledge of God attainable by the natural reason from a study of the Natural Order. Revealed Theology confirmed the truths of Natural Theology and offered further knowledge of God disclosed in the Christian Revelation. Together they formed one scheme of theology. The main evidences for the truth of Natural Theology were the traditional proofs for the existence of God, but the evidences for the truth of Revealed Theology could not be so directly rational. They were primarily the external evidences from miracle and prophecy to show that Jesus was divine and therefore a trustworthy revealer of the divine mysteries; and secondarily the internal evidences which showed that what had been revealed was congruent with the insights of reason and conscience. This pattern of evidences was dislocated when, in a delayed crisis, the advance of the historical method raised doubts in the middle of the 19th century in England about the literal inerrancy of the Bible. The challenge of Biblical Criticism was met by the Cambridge Biblical School, which accepted the historical method and used it in a manner free from excessive scepticism and excessive conservatism. The Theological Tripos, therefore, gained parity of academic esteem by using the same methods as the secular historians and by using them with equal integrity. But this achievement, in so far as it was a pure act of historical recollection, had the natural limitation of any such act. This limitation is that to recall what has been said and done in the past does not determine whether what was said and done was true or right. Historical theology could, therefore, never fully take the place of the earlier pattern of evidences for the truth and excellency of the Christian religion. In 1906, a new section was added to the Tripos, entitled "The Philosophy of Religion and Christian Ethics". It was in this developing situation that, in 1929 and 1930, F. R. Tennant published his two volumes on *Philosophical Theology*, and, in 1931, John Oman published his great work on *The Natural and the Supernatural*. The first recalled the tradition of Natural Theology in presenting a restatement of the teleological argument. The second recalled the tradition of Revealed Theology, not by any restatement of the arguments for the divinity of Christ from miracle and prophecy, but by a fresh study and presentation of the congruency of divine revelation with the highest insights of man. The form

and manner of this presentation was, naturally, influenced by the great advances of the empirical methods, particularly by the progress of the natural sciences which had appeared to show the supremacy of various kinds of naturalism that left no secure place for the supernatural. Moreover, the philosophy of Bergson appeared to substitute for the God of Christianity a blind evolutionary impulse. Finally, advances in the field of comparative religion had tended to throw doubt on the uniqueness of the Christian religion. A new study of the nature and truth of religion was opportune.

How did this volume meet this situation? The main theme in the first two parts, (I) "Scope and Method", (II) "Knowing and Knowledge", is that "We know our environment only as we rightly live in it, and we rise to the height of its meaning according to the kind of persons we are" (p. 204). The total environment to which we must respond includes both the Natural and the Supernatural. "As the natural world is known by sensation and its varied comparative values, so the supernatural world is known by the sense of the holy and its sacred or absolute values; and for practical purposes, the distinction between the Natural and the Supernatural is between comparative value and absolute" (p. 69). "We know the Supernatural as it reflects itself in the sense of the holy and has for us absolute value directly and without further argument: and the question is not that it exists, but how it exists in its relation to us and our relation to it" (p. 72). It is in responding to the Supernatural that we escape from the web of merely utilitarian calculations designed to increase our pleasure and to safeguard our physical survival. "Thus by the judgment of the sacred, man was set free from the leading-strings of nature, the nurse which, with the immediate values of the visible world, had hitherto nurtured all living creatures" (p. 85). But this response to the Supernatural includes a true response to the Natural. The response must be free. It must be sincere. It must be our own. Unfortunately, we often relapse into bad religion, not simply as a result of spiritual insincerity and cowardice, but because we have come to adopt a theory of the world and of ourselves which inhibits our proper response to our natural and supernatural environment. If we begin to think mistakenly about our environment, we cannot experience it truly. "We can argue ourselves out of any experience and, without right thinking, we cannot rightly receive the plainest facts" (p. 96). For instance, we may wrongly suppose that mere reasoning will disclose to us the nature of reality or that what is real is disclosed only and wholly in sensation. Meaning can never be extracted from motion. "A start is made with physical impacts; then somehow sensations are their passive effects; then sensations are somehow associated into perception, and perceptions somehow into judgments: till we arrive at rational beings in a rational world, all fashioned out of the clay of physical impacts" (p. 168). To avoid these mistakes, we must reject false theories of the world and regain the kind of simple and direct vision enjoyed by children, poets and seers. "To be obtuse in feeling is merely to be wall-eyed before every kind of reality" (p. 79). We

must cultivate an awareness which is deeper than particular acts of apprehension, comprehension and explanation. In the third part of the book, on "Necessity and Freedom", Oman is dealing with the status of religion in a world increasingly interpreted in evolutionary terms. There is evolution but it is not an evolution of the higher out of the lower. "All evolution of life is by venture on a higher environment: and this process can neither be reversed nor stereotyped. Life may have started in the water, but the creature that has learned to live in the air, if it return to the water, does not become a fish but a corpse" (p. 294). In the various forms of determinism which would preclude this interpretation of religion, as a progressive response to the call of the supernatural, we mistake the abstract logical necessity which holds between logically static symbols for the real world in which we directly experience conflict and freedom. The concluding part of the book, on "The Evanescent and the Eternal", offers a classification of religions and a penetrating study of various problems about religion. The essential fact about religions is "that not one of them is concerned with mere rules of conduct about the Natural nor with mere systems of ideas about the Supernatural, but that all are concerned with the environment in which man lives and by which he lives if he is to live rightly, their faith in the supernatural environment never being determined, at least religiously, by mere theory, but always by the exercise of it in the face of the natural" (p. 370).

It cannot be claimed that, over the last thirty years, this notable book has proved to be the beginning of a dominant movement in the field of philosophical theology. Other movements have achieved greater popularity. Biblical theology has emphasized the centrality of the Christian Revelation. Neo-scholasticism has revived the claim that rational theology need not be a barren rationalism. The validity of religious experience and the status of absolute values have continued to be open to psychological attack. Existentialism has tended to undermine the confident belief that man has a true nature and a true environment. Logical positivism has shaken confidence in the capacity of the human mind to think meaningfully and reliably about what lies beyond the range of ordinary human experience. Philosophical analysis has fostered an impatience with the reiteration of august words in biblical and philosophical theology which appear to lack precise and intelligible meaning. The widespread metaphysical diffidence and the grinding process of analysis have led some to find in mystical religious experience a form of religion which is invulnerable to the ordinary canons of criticism. Finally, the experience of a second World War and other appalling events of recent history have tended to produce a cynical and disillusioned attitude which is easily resentful of what might appear to be excessive confidence in the reality and supremacy of the supernatural. For these, and, no doubt for other reasons, we stand a long way away from the 1930s and this book.

But to recognize that these movements have been influential is not the same as admitting that they are always an improvement on

what preceded them. It may legitimately be suggested that, even if some of these movements mark a genuine advance beyond the outlook of "the Natural and the Supernatural", they might have been free from certain excesses if the lessons of Oman's book had been better learnt. He did not overlook the importance of Christian theology, but deliberately omitted any special study of the Christian revelation. "This inquiry," he wrote, ". . . is an attempt to lay a foundation for theology, by considering its method and its problems. It does not aim at defending the theology of any religion, but its purpose is to discover what should be settled before any particular question is raised" (p. 98). The book would, however, have been more readily recognized as instructive for Christian readers if it had included a study of the person and work of Christ. Even so, Oman showed the danger of commending the Supernatural as something which goes quite beyond our finest insights into truth, goodness, and beauty. His sound comments upon the character of genuine religious experience could have been a useful warning against so emphasizing the uniqueness of Christ that he recedes beyond the limits of our powers of appreciation. For somewhat similar reasons, Oman's book could have been a word of caution against too easily taking refuge in a mysticism which loses touch with rational and moral insight and is not disciplined by a proper respect for empirical facts and by a recognition of the irreducible difference between the being of man and the absolute being of God. But I do feel that, at times, Oman interprets rationalism in a way which hardly does justice to the wider and deeper rationalism of his own religious attitude. He is most effective in his sustained criticism of any narrow-sighted empiricism. He shows effectively that our experience of the world is not basically of a whirling chaos of sense data into which we later try to introduce some measure of meaning and value. He could have been a useful guide to the cruder Logical Positivists. He also shows that we cannot divide our experience into the facts of the case and our interpretation of the facts because our beliefs about the world affect what we recognize as facts and what we feel about the world. There is no such thing as a purely logical or a purely factual study of the world. Though these insights remain true and valuable, it must be admitted that those who desire precision and exact uniformity in the use of words do not find Oman easy to follow. This can be shown by taking every reference to the Supernatural and then trying to produce an absolutely clear definition of its meaning.

It may well be that, in claiming that divine revelation can only be experienced in the adventure of living according to our highest insights, the book has not commended itself, either to those who defend revelation upon the ground of its utter uniqueness or to those who deny revelation on the ground of theories of knowledge and of the world which preclude both having the experience and accepting it as significant. Nevertheless, it remains a great book. In the 19th century we faced a series of biblical problems which could not be solved by biblical fundamentalism. In this century, we face

a series of doctrinal problems which cannot be solved by doctrinal fundamentalism. Nor can they be met by a more intensive use of the historical method. In this grave situation it is most salutary to study *The Natural and the Supernatural*. The book offers a breadth of vision and a bracing and wholesome atmosphere in which we can be made suspicious of answers to our problems which leave our problems unsolved and in which we can be fortified to undertake the hazardous venture of more detailed acts of theological reconstruction. But those who complacently proceed to reassess John Oman may find themselves awakening to the humbling fact that they have been reassessed by him.

G. F. Woods.

"We Receive This Child"

The Liturgical Commission's proposed Services for Baptism and Confirmation have, to the dismay of not a few critics, omitted this phrase. It is natural that strong, if not wholly informed, exception has been taken to such a suggestion. The remainder of the phrase ([I] "sign thee with the sign of the cross") is of course retained. As a result of inquiries made from two dioceses overseas, as well as in private conversation, I was led to investigate the history of the phrase with the invaluable help of Brightman's *English Rite*. The results are, I think, important, and should be made available.

The section, beginning "We receive this child", is often spoken of as the "Reception into the Church". Is this true, and in what sense? Does it imply two distinct and separable actions, viz.: (i) Baptism with (ii) subsequent Reception? The theology of the successive revisions of the Prayer Book in 1549, 1552 and 1662 is clear and consistent *except for one unfortunate lapse in 1662* (Private Baptism). This has led, I suggest, to the common misunderstanding which can be illustrated by the description I heard in rural Sussex of a child, baptized privately at home but not yet brought to church, as "half-baptized". This error (or at least confusion) is perpetuated by the heading in the 1928 Private Baptism service "The Reception of the Child", and is made still worse in the alternative York service, which has been sufficiently exposed by Prof. Ratcliff in Theology, November 1960.

What does the Prayer Book teach about the relation between Baptism and Reception?

If we examine the different revisions we come across some interesting facts. Four or five points in the Baptismal Rite are involved, viz.:

(1) The giving of the Christian name.
(2) Signing with the Cross.
(3) Baptism.
(4) So-called "Reception" (viz.: this formula).
(5) Any subsequent ceremonies (omitted since 1549 but capable of addition if desired, e.g. the giving of a candle).

In 1549 the first part of the Rite was *at the church door* and followed the Latin "Making of a Catechumen". It included (1) and (2). After proceeding to the font there followed (3), nothing equivalent to (4), then (5) (*a*) putting on of the "white vesture", or Chrisom and (*b*) Anointing. The formula used at (2) (Signing), an adaptation from Hermann of Cologne, was "N, Receive the sign of the holy Cross both in thy forehead and in thy breast, in token that thou shalt not be ashamed to confess thy faith in Christ crucified, etc."

1552 sensibly attempted to rationalize the Rite, i.e. to make one service out of the Making of a Catechumen and the actual Baptismal Rite, and this has remained in essence untouched in 1662, and to this day. It directed all to be done *at the font* and in the order—(1) (Naming), (3) (Baptism), then (2) (Signing), with (4) the formula which then appeared for the first time "*We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock* and do sign him with the sign of the Cross, in token, etc."

The new 1552 phrase (for which Brightman gives no suggestion of source) contains the equivocal word "congregation" and has retained it ever since, despite Cosin's proposal for its substitution by "Church of Christ". But the word requires attention as the 1552 phrase might have been thought to suggest that Reception meant into *this* congregation rather than into the Church universal. No doubt the revisers were influenced by the general Reformed preference for the translation of *Ecclesia* by "congregation" rather than "Church".[1] But it is abundantly clear that they did mean the Church, as is shown from an examination of the word in the three revisions. 1549, 1552, and 1662 alike use the phrase in the opening rubric "that the *congregation there present* may testify the *receiving* of them that be newly baptized into the number of *Christ's Church*", followed by the phrase in the opening exhortation that the purpose of the Rite is that "they may be baptized with ("water and" since 1552) the Holy Ghost and *received into Christ's holy Church*". The following prayer in all three asks that the candidates may be "*received* into the ark of Christ's *Church*". 1549 in the Exorcism (omitted since) uses the phrase "these infants whom our Lord Jesus Christ has vouchsafed to call to his Holy Baptism to be made members of his Body, and of his holy *congregation*". The only other uses of the word "congregation" in 1549 refer clearly to the congregation "here present".

1552 provided a new closing section after the Reception which uses the word "congregation" three times.

(*a*) Seeing now "that these children be regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's *congregation*".

(*b*) In the subsequent thanksgiving, "that it hath pleased thee to

[1] Cosin (Works V, p. 520) objected to "congregation" as "a new word never used in any former Liturgy or ancient writer in the Church", and said that the Roman Catholics might take exception against it "with some advantage to themselves". He urged therefore that it should be "altered and put into the old usual expression of the word, that is, 'Church of Christ' ".

regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption and to incorporate him into thy holy *congregation*".

(*c*) "that finally with the residue of thy holy *congregation*, etc."

In each of these three phrases 1662 changes "congregation" into "Church", following the example (according to Brightman) of the Scottish Book of 1637, making it entirely clear that Baptism does "*receive*" a child not merely into a "congregation" but *into the "Church"*.

It might be argued that as in public Baptism the two acts of Baptism and Reception follow immediately one upon another, the question is academic and matters little. But we must now examine the arrangements under the heading of Private Baptism. Provision for this emergency was made from 1549, and it is made abundantly clear in 1549, 1552, and 1662 alike that such a child, privately baptized in emergency, is "lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again". The purpose of bringing the child to church is twofold:

(*a*) to certify the congregation (1662) of the proper Baptism of the new member; and

(*b*) to provide him with godparents.

But it is reiterated that the minister "shall not christen the child again, but shall *receive*[1] *him as one of the flock of true Christian* people". This is interpreted as one who "is" (sc. already) "by *the laver of regeneration in Baptism* made the child of God, etc."—1552 and 1662 read after the word Baptism "*received into the number of the* children of God", as if to reinforce the point. In the exhortation upon the words of the Gospel it is emphasized that "(Christ) *hath received* this present infant . . . hath embraced him with the arms of his mercy"—past tenses in deliberate contrast with the future tenses of the same exhortation when used before the Baptism of the child in the office of Public Baptism.

In 1549 (1) (Naming) and (3) (Baptism) took place in the house, but (2) *no* Signing took place either in the house or in church. So also in 1552; but in 1552, which had introduced (4) (Reception) into the Public Baptism service, *it also does not appear either in the house or in the church*. The formula "We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock" thus does not appear at all, and the doctrine therefore is still consistent throughout. It is in 1662 that the confusion is introduced by the provision that when the child is brought to church, after the godparents have taken the promises, and the subsequent prayer, the priest shall say "We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock and do sign him with the sign of the cross, etc." It is this section which 1928 heads "The Reception of the Child". What is here meant by the word "Reception"? The title describes it more carefully as "The Public Receiv-

[1] It might have avoided confusion if such a word as "accept" or "recognize" had stood for "receive".

ing of such as have been Privately Baptized". It is very unfortunate, to begin with, that the word "receive" is used. What is meant is accepted, acknowledged, recognized, *as already baptized* and *received into the Church*. It might seem as if 1662 intended us to suppose that Baptism was in the house and the Reception in church, i.e. that there *are* after all two distinct acts, and this would be contrary to all the evidence quoted above.

But the facts of the history seem to be these, and they are of considerable importance. The section with which we are dealing was introduced, as indicated by Brightman, under the influence of Cosin. The reference to Cosin's "Particulars to be considered, explained and corrected in the Book of Common Prayer" (Vol. V in his works in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology) shows that his concern was that the child should in any contingency "*have the sign of the cross made upon it*". His own proposal apparently was that in such case the sign of the cross with the words "We receive this child, etc." should be given *in the house* (p. 521, note). This followed, according to him, current Roman Catholic practice (pp. 141-2), by which the sign of the cross was given with the pouring of the water. But this was not accepted by the revisers in 1662, and the signing accompanied by the formula above was added at the bringing of the child to church. What they were concerned to secure was the signing of the cross, and *the signing carried with it the phrase*. (As we have seen, they did not alter the word "congregation". Was there still some confusion in their minds in refusing to accept the word "Church" here?) At that crucial point the 1662 revisers went wrong, and this appears to have been due to the intense desire, a matter then of high controversy, to assure that every child baptized by the Prayer Book should at some point receive the sign of the cross. Otherwise we might imagine scrupulous dissenting parents having their children baptized on some pretext privately, and later brought to church, so evading the objectionable ceremony. Thus we have an equivocal formula which suggests a false theology and has without doubt led to a wide misunderstanding (even among clergy) of the meaning of this phrase both in private baptism and (reflected back) in public baptism.

The views of two other of the revisers in 1660-1, though they did not influence the final decisions, are of interest at this point, and my attention has been drawn to them in W. Jacobson's *Fragmentary Illustrations of the History of the Book of Common Prayer* (1874), pp. 34 and 87. Bishop Sanderson's suggestions, apparently for use during the time of the proscription of the Prayer Book, omit the sign of the cross, though retaining the formula, "We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock, with this hope that *he* will account it no shame to confess the faith of Christ crucified. . . ." Bishop Wren's proposals are more important, as they were made directly in view of the projected revision, and recognize clearly the theological issue. They run thus: (after the actual Baptism) "Then the Priest shall make a Cross on the Child's forehead, after that he hath said, Having now baptized this Child into Christ, and thereby

received it into Christ's Church, and the Congregation of His flock, *we* (sic) do sign it with the sign of the Cross, etc."

Owing to the confusion caused by the phrase and the dubious theology connected with it, the Liturgical Commission has a strong case for omitting the phrase alike in Public Baptism and in the bringing to church of a child, or adult, baptized privately.

It may well be that a welcome to the newly baptized by the "congregation present" is too familiar and indeed valuable a feature of the ceremony to be altogether omitted. Moreover, it is now not an uncommon practice for the words to be said by the congregation with the minister. This presents its own difficulties, since "we" can "receive", but presumably only one (the minister) can "sign"—without intolerable confusion! To use such a phrase as "Having now received this child" (sc. by *baptism*) would be theologically accurate but liturgically cumbersome. Ultimately some method might be devised for preserving what is undoubtedly valuable without leading to theological ambiguity. But the Liturgical Commission may claim credit for having at least raised the issue in the interests of a clear theology and accurate phrasing.

HENRY, KNARESBOROUGH.

The Mothers' Union, Marriage and the Church

THE Mothers' Union is virtually *the* women's organization of the Anglican Church. It has served the Church for eighty years. Its membership now, at home and overseas, totals over half a million. Few Christians would wish to disagree with its aims:

1. To uphold the sanctity of marriage.
2. To awaken in all mothers a sense of their great responsibility in the training of their boys and girls—the fathers and mothers of the future.
3. To organize in every place a band of mothers who will unite in prayer, and seek by their own example to lead their families in purity and holiness of life.

But the size of the Mothers' Union, and the fact that it is in very many parishes the only women's organization, and could be displaced only with very considerable disturbance to the life of the Church in the parish, must give it inevitably a tremendous responsibility.

It is sometimes suggested that the Mothers' Union is something like a Teetotallers' Union, which you could belong to if you agreed with its aims or go elsewhere if you did not. The Bishop of Exeter in an address on the Mothers' Union given to his Diocesan Conference last November makes such a suggestion. He maintains it is a society like many others that "exist within the common life of the Church for certain limited purposes". However, he sees the danger: "But if any one of them ever becomes confused with the Church as a whole . . ." The fact is that by reason of its size alone there is in

practice an almost inevitable confusion between the Mothers' Union and the Church as a whole just because there is no alternative women's organization on offer. This is in part the result of the Mothers' Union's success. But it is this that particularly gives to it such responsibility.

In fact, the responsibility of the Mothers' Union where the Church and Marriage is concerned could hardly be greater. With so much ground level contact with families it has the most tremendous power to interpret the mind and heart of the Church. Few can doubt that, in fact, many more would have found themselves in the Divorce Courts but for the strength they have received through the Mothers' Union.

But the responsibility of what is, in fact, *the* women's organization of the Church in many parishes cannot be limited to those who have not reached the Divorce Courts. In 1959 there were 23,837 divorces in England, and the women's organization of the Church has this fact to reckon with.

The Church of England as a whole has determined how it shall deal with this situation. In 1957 an Act of Convocation was declared by the Archbishop of Canterbury which stated that when those who have contracted a marriage in civil law during the lifetime of a former partner desire to receive the Holy Communion, and the bishop is satisfied that they are in good faith, that their receiving of the sacraments would be for the good of their souls and ought not to cause offence to the Church, he can give his approval. But the Mothers' Union, the "handmaid" of the Church, we are often told, the handmaid of the *episcopal* church, whilst not directly opposing the bishop's decision, by its refusal to admit the wife to full membership of the Mothers' Union, certainly does not support with enthusiasm, is not a *handmaid* to the decision of the bishop. And in practice it means that the wife will often feel she has been reconciled to the Church but not to membership of the women's organization of the Church. She may indeed have been told by her local Mothers' Union representative (not without more authoritative support), as was a mother known to me, the mother of two children by a second marriage, who had been reconciled by the bishop, that she would be living in sin until her husband returned to his first wife.

Now that the Church must make a stand for Christian marriage few Christians would wish to deny. This is why Convocation has also determined that no public service shall be held for those who have contracted a civil marriage after divorce. But it must be a matter of serious concern to the Church if, having decided how it shall make its stand, an organization of such power as the Mothers' Union, claiming to support the Church, seeming to the uninitiated to be part of the Church, takes the action it does.

Part of the trouble is that, in order to claim that it is supporting the Church, the Mothers' Union deliberately turns a blind eye to the extent of the division of opinion which has existed in the Church of England, from the Reformation to the present day, in its

teaching and practice in respect of the indissolubility of marriage, pretending often that apart from a disloyal and insignificant minority the Church of England has spoken on this matter with a single voice, and that what the Mothers' Union teaches is therefore to all intents and purposes what anyone who is true to the Church of England must teach.

There are, of course, those who believe that a marriage cannot be dissolved. Once made, they would say it is taken from the realm of human choice and decision. But there are others who believe that a marriage ought not to be dissolved, for the most binding reason to a Christian that it is God's will that marriage should be a life-long partnership, and that anything less than this is not only falling short of an ideal, but a direct contradiction of his love revealed in Jesus Christ. But they recognize that men do act in a way which is contrary to God's will where marriage (and much more than marriage) is concerned, and that God's love is revealed in his forgiving grace and power in the un-ideal reality of the new situation. They would feel that it is wholly insufficient to describe a second marriage in every instance as "living in sin", and that the sanctity of marriage is not upheld by refusing to admit the possibility of sanctity in any other relationship than a first union.

Again, part of the trouble is that those in authority in the Mothers' Union take the line that when the Bible speaks of a man and wife being "one flesh" this means that an irreversible ontological relationship has been established, something beyond the control of the husband and wife. But others would maintain that the Bible does indeed lead us to believe that a new unit has been created, a relationship in God's sight, but not one that ceases to depend on human will and decision.

Yet another part of the trouble is that those in authority in the Mothers' Union, whom one would not expect to be "fundamentalist" where the Bible is concerned, seem suddenly to become so over certain of the New Testament texts on marriage and divorce where they feel fundamentalism would assist their argument.

There have, of course, from time to time been rumblings of discontent in the Mothers' Union, but these have up to now been quietened, not least by the suggestion that those who disagree with the Mothers' Union line are sentimental, or, failing that, disloyal. But the rumblings that are now to be heard are not by those who disagree with the Mothers' Union aims, or who do not see the need of the Church to stand for Christian marriage, or who wish to break up the Mothers' Union or found alternative organizations, but from those who, valuing the great service that the Mothers' Union has rendered to the Church in the last eighty years, wish to fight for Christian marriage from a biblical, theological, and pastoral position of greater integrity than they think is revealed by the present policies of the Mothers' Union where the treatment of those who have remarried after divorce is concerned. They too (can the Mothers' Union believe it?) also want to "safeguard Christian marriage".

Mandell Creighton, the great Bishop of Peterborough and later of London, at the turn of the century—hardly a disloyal member of the Church (his hymn "O thou who gavest power to love" is surely one of our best marriage hymns)—wrote concerning the teaching and practice of the Church on marriage and divorce:

"Speaking generally, the question raises in its extremest form the problem of the actual application to life of the principles of the Gospel. We must remember—it cannot be remembered too much—that the Gospel consists of principles, not of maxims. The only possible principle concerning marriage is that it is indissoluble. But all principles are set aside by sin: and our Lord recognized that as regards marriage. . . ."

ERIC JAMES.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. J. H. L. Waterson is Rector of Stoke D'Abernon, Surrey.

The Rev. G. F. Woods is Fellow and Dean of Downing College, Cambridge.

The Rev. Eric James is Vicar of St George's, Camberwell.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

CATHEDRALS

SIR,

It is sad to think that the Church Assembly will no longer be enlivened and informed by speeches from Dr Norman Sykes in the manner of the article you publish in your May number on the Cathedrals' Commission Report.

I think it is only fair to Dr Sykes' memory and to the Commission that I should make a few factual comments on his article.

(1) No attempt was made in the Commission's Report to "unscramble the eggs" resulting from the 1840 Act of Parliament on Cathedral endowments. Every century has to bear its own burden of responsibility in these matters, and we could only deal with the situation as we found it.

(2) There was no idea in the mind of the Commission that Cathedral Chapters should be reduced to a Dean and two Canons. This figure of three was, and is, purely intended as the limit up to which the Church Commissioners are ready to pay the whole stipend. For this particular purpose it was felt that all Cathedrals had to be treated alike and the actual difficulty was to persuade some modern Cathedrals to find room for two Canons.

(3) In calculating the profit and loss for Cathedrals on the new scheme—particularly in relation to Cathedral houses—Dr Sykes does not mention the fact that the Church Commissioners are willing "to assist financially" such a scheme, nor does he point out that in paying the annual premiums Chapters would, of course, be relieved

from paying the repair bills which at present fall entirely on them.

(4) With regard to the Fabric Equalization Fund, it is realized that there are misgivings about this part of the plan. As a consequence, all Cathedrals have been asked to state clearly their own wishes and to give further information in connexion with this proposal. These answers are now coming in and revealing a perplexing diversity, some being strongly in favour and some strongly against the scheme. Only patient thought and prayer will reveal the statesmanlike way of handling this question.

Yours faithfully,
RONALD LEICESTER,
Chairman of Cathedrals Commission.

BISHOP'S LODGE,
SPRINGFIELD ROAD,
LEICESTER.

THE METHODIST COVENANT SERVICE

DEAR SIR,

Christians of other traditions can appreciate the Methodists' devotion to their Covenant Service, which in one form or another has been part of their praxis ever since the days of John Wesley; but, when Methodists seek to commend it for use by others, as the Rev. Rupert E. Davies does in your February number, those others may be allowed to express their misgivings.

Personally, I find the service difficult to accept for the following reasons:

1. It tends to confuse the meaning of the word "covenant". Admittedly, support can be found in the Bible for the idea of engaging oneself to be the Lord's; but there can be no doubt that the predominant meaning is not this. The predominant meaning is the covenant made by God, and the other is a secondary meaning. In the 1936 form of the service, and still more in the Church of South India's adaptation of it (put out provisionally in 1956 for optional use), efforts have been made to place a proper emphasis on the predominant meaning. Nevertheless, it is the secondary meaning which gives the service its *raison d'être,* and therefore this is bound to remain. It appears in uneasy juxtaposition to the other, and the result is unfortunate. Thus, in the Introduction, after due reference to God's covenant, it is said that we meet "that we may . . . renew the Covenant which binds us to God". (I quote from the C.S.I. version.) But surely the covenant that binds us to God is "the new covenant in my blood", and there can be no question of our being called upon to renew that.

2. It tends to make the climax of the service, i.e. the making of the so-called covenant, an act of the human individual by himself. He makes it, and God is asked to ratify it. Afterwards, the Eucharist may or may not follow. But, in fact, can Pelagius offer himself to

God apart from the sacrifice of Christ? It seems to me that, in so far as the intention of this service is legitimate, the Eucharist itself provides for it in a much better manner.

3. The rather hectic words in which the "covenant" is expressed might understandably be spoken by someone in the emotional stress of an experience of evangelical conversion. Repeated year by year by an ordinary congregation they sound histrionic (to a non-Methodist) and savour of cant.

I find it necessary to take with a grain of salt Mr Davies' assertions that the service is entirely scriptural and not at all subjective.

Yours faithfully,

C. B. Firth.

Union Kanarese Seminary,
Tumkur,
S. India.

CHAPTER 13 AND THE PASSION NARRATIVE IN ST MARK

Dear Sir,

The Rev. Francis Dewar's article "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St Mark" throws light on many parts of the Marcan apocalypse without, I feel, quite managing to illuminate the whole. The colourful and picturesque language, we are told, is to be interpreted spiritually as referring to Christ's passion and to the future trials of Christians for which this sets the pattern. The physical destruction of the temple about which the disciples ask is unimportant beside the spiritual destruction to which Jesus points in his reply. We emerge somewhat bemused, thankful to our guide for bringing us through the jungle so skilfully, but not really confident that we could repeat the performance unaided.

Let us abandon spiritual interpretations of the physical events portrayed and then see if the apparent difficulties and contradictions of this passage do not fall into place. The physical events are the passion of Jesus and the final tribulation, the destruction of the fleshly temple of Christ's body and the destruction of the stone temple in Jerusalem. But was the physical destruction of the Jerusalem temple important? Let there be no doubt about this; it was fundamental. Such an event, as distinct from the desecration of Daniel 11. 31, was never foreseen even in the most lurid of Old Testament prophesies, for to a Jew it was inconceivable; to a first-century Christian it could be conceived of only in connexion with the End of all things. Thus the disciples' question about when it should happen was essentially a question about when the Kingdom of God should come, to which the Marcan apocalypse is the reply, accompanied by suitable exhortations to be prepared. But St Mark also compares the coming tribulations to Christ's passion. The hour which Jesus knows but of which the disciples are ignorant is the hour of his passion when the temple of his body will be destroyed; the hour which is known only to the Father is the hour of the final

tribulation and the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem; let the disciples not be found sleeping in that hour. Before it comes they will be delivered up to councils, beaten and brought before governors and kings just as Jesus was, and even like him put to death. When the arrival of the abomination of desolation signifies the time to flee let them not return for a cloak, any more than did the young man who fled naked at the arrival of Judas. The darkness of the crucifixion foreshadows the darkness which shall mark the end of the tribulations and the glorious coming of the Son of Man. And the point of these parallels is that Jesus's death in Jerusalem is the prophetic inauguration of a period which the destruction of the temple shall bring to an end.

This, I suggest, is the plain and straightforward interpretation of St Mark's apocalypse and passion narrative. It does, of course, raise difficulties of a doctrinal kind. Was Jesus himself mistaken about the nature or the time of the parousia, or was the mistake St Mark's and that of the early Church? In either case how is the error to be explained? But it is surely far better for theologians to face these difficulties squarely than to try to circumvent them by "spiritualizing" the plain meaning of the gospel record.

Yours faithfully,
M. L. Sanderson.

Meru,
Kenya.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Church and the Age of Reason (1648–1789). By G. R. Cragg. Penguin Books. 1960. 5s.

"It is clearly a grave injustice to treat this period as the preserve of a dull and prosaic Christianity. It is equally foolish to ignore its manifest defects." This is the viewpoint of Dr Cragg's book, which is the first of five volumes in the new Pelican History of the Church edited by Prof. Owen Chadwick. In this volume Dr Cragg traces the history of the Church from the peace of Westphalia to the French Revolution. Of course he has to be selective; of course he has to compress. But the writing is good and well informed, and on the whole the author has succeeded admirably in giving a vivid and balanced picture of the Church in the British Isles, France, Germany, Russia, and the New World.

Though Dr Cragg handles the background and narrative of his book convincingly, his chief strength lies in his exposition of the thought of the period. This was to be expected from the author of *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason*; however, to find the same qualities in a book which covers a wider area and a larger period is sheer gain.

It is also an advantage that this particular volume should be written by a Free Church scholar. There is much in the earlier part of the book to shake Anglican complacency, and the picture of the

eighteenth-century nonconformist meeting house is among the best things in the book. Unfortunately, there is no description of the Anglican parish church of the period to go along with it. Anglicanism, however, receives fair and accurate assessment, mainly on the judicious lines laid down by Dr Norman Sykes. Of Church life outside England there is a powerful description of the discipline exercised by the Scottish kirk-session, a good account of Pietism in Germany, and, as is to be expected from a Canadian author, an intriguing chapter entitled "Christianity in the New World". He also throws some light on the process by which in Prussia the *cujus regio ejus religio* principle gave way to Erastianism.

Though Dr Cragg gives due attention to eighteenth-century philanthropy he fails to draw our attention to the close connexion between the Age of Reason and the Age of Benevolence. The underlying assumptions were: "God is wise, God is kind. Men must therefore be reasonable in their belief and generous in their conduct." On the whole, the thought of religious leaders is magnificently handled (but it is to be regretted that that of George Fox receives scanty treatment). It is surprising to find no mention of the place of the annual conference in Methodism from its earliest years, and it is misleading to give the impression that early Evangelical Anglicans were Calvinistic Puritans; some were, others like Charles Simeon and John Venn were not.

However, these are minor blemishes in a book that deserves to be read widely and is especially welcome, arriving simultaneously with Steven Watson's *The Reign of George III* and Harold Nicholson's *The Age of Reason.*

Michael Hennell.

St Aidan's College,
Birkenhead.

Christ in the Theology of St Paul. By L. Cerfaux. Herder and Herder; Nelson. 1959. 50s.

This book first appeared in 1951, and Dr C. K. Barrett wrote in *J.T.S.* (1952): "Not all its details will command assent, but it is a great book, and one that could with advantage be translated into English." Though the present translation is seriously defective, the truth of Dr Barrett's verdict shines through.

The author believes that Paul's thought can only be understood in its chronological development. "The principle (*sic*) factors of Paul's christology remain constant throughout the epistles"; on the other hand, "it is impossible to make one synthesis of Paul's thought that will be faithful to every stage of his career. Thus we have distinguished three successive levels in his development which are clearly differentiated because at each level his centre of interest is different" (p. 529). The work is divided into three books dealing with each of these centres.

(1) Book One: Christ the Saviour—based on 1 and 2 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians 15. The Resurrection of Christ is Paul's

starting point, as the guarantee of salvation at the Parousia, which is at this stage central in his thought. However, the Resurrection, from being the promise of life at the Parousia, becomes the promise of life now, a development Cerfaux connects with Paul's arrival in Greece. The literary antithesis "death: resurrection" gives way to that of "death: life"; Paul expounds Christ's death as clearing the ground for life to reign. But in general his death and even more his Incarnation are only important as necessary antecedents of the Resurrection. Paul would not have followed later Greek theologians in regarding the Incarnation as in itself bringing salvation or divinization (p. 168).

(2) Book Two: The Gift of Christ—based on Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans. Controversies with Judaizers in Galatia and adherents of Greek philosophy in Corinth lead Paul to expound the new being we have in Christ in terms of Christ "the justice of God" and "the wisdom of God". Cerfaux shows that Paul came more and more to think of Christ's work in terms of his *person,* which is prior to any collective or mythological categories in all his thought.

(3) Book Three: The Mystery of Christ—the Captivity Epistles. As a result of his ministry in Asia, Paul pays less attention to eschatology and to the effects of Christ's presence in the world, but tries to plumb the secrets of his work and person; there is a corresponding emphasis on Christian progress in understanding. Cerfaux examines closely the christological hymns (1 Tim. 3. 16; Phil. 2. 5–11; Col. 1. 15–20), and the various titles and descriptions of Christ.

This sketch cannot do justice to his combination of detailed exegesis and broad synthesis. His treatment of the Parousia, the term "Kyrios" and Paul's literary formulas is particularly good. He draws on the whole field of continental scholarship, and is refreshingly liberal in his approach, even if his conclusions are conservative. At certain points it is evident he wrote before the Qumran material had been evaluated, and many details are questionable—in particular the exegesis of Rom. 5. 1–12 (pp. 230–35), supporting the Vulgate "in *quo* omnes peccaverunt" (5. 12); and it is hard to believe that "that which restraineth" in 2 Thess. 2 is the preaching of the gospel (p. 47), in spite of Matt. 24. 12. More surprising is his failure to justify or even discuss the dating of the epistles on which his thesis is based; there is no mention of G. S. Duncan's *St Paul's Ephesian Ministry* or C. H. Dodd's papers on *The Mind of Paul.*

The book is beautifully set out, with summaries and syntheses to guide the reader. The print is large and widely spaced, so that even the footnotes are a pleasure to read. And since there is no comparable work in English, 50s. would seem well spent—at least by a library. Yet the translation is deplorable. It is not that the translators (two theological students) have not taken considerable trouble or that their version is consistently unreadable, but that good will alone is not enough. They lack competent knowledge of classics, biblical scholarship, and even French (e.g. "croissance" translated "belief", p. 93); they lack, too, the precision necessary for scholarly work. If publishers are unable to find translators who fully under-

stand the language and subject matter of a book, they might at least have the translation read before publication by someone who does.

J. P. M. Sweet.

Selwyn College,
Cambridge.

Newman the Theologian. By J. H. Walgrave, O.P. Translated by A. V. Littledale. Geoffrey Chapman. 1960. 35s.

The title of this book in the original French is *Newman, le Développement du Dogme*, which, in contrast to that of the English translation, has the merit of telling the reader instantly and precisely what it is about. The author's sole aim is to deal comprehensively with Newman's theory of doctrinal development, to assemble, as he says in his preface, all of Newman's observations on development in order to compare and evaluate them and to work out a synthesis, and after reading over the preface, one is likely to feel that the title of the translation is more than a little pretentious, even with the sub-title—the Nature of Belief and Doctrine as Exemplified in His Life and Work—in view. But after a reading of the entire book, one feels that it is a quite satisfactory title, for with each succeeding chapter it becomes increasingly clear to the reader that the author's subject *is* Newman the Theologian and not merely Newman's doctrine of development.

Father Walgrave does not then confine himself to a circumscribed treatment of development. He essays to set out the whole psychological and apologetical context of the theory. One of the reasons, he aptly remarks, why so many studies of Newman are unbalanced and misleading is that they give insufficient attention to the structure of Newman's thought as a whole, and he is careful not to make that mistake. An indication of his endeavour to deal with the whole range of Newman's thought can be seen in his consideration of the "general" psychology of Newman's doctrine (there are further chapters on its "specific" and "social" psychology), in which he treats in detail such matters as growth and knowledge, development and reasoning, our knowledge of the concrete, "first principles", implicit and explicit reasoning, the "convergence of probabilities", faith and theology, and the relation between the intuition of faith and dogmatic formulas. And he is equally thorough and comprehensive throughout.

The first part of his book is given over to a description of the sequence of Newman's spiritual and intellectual attitudes, especially as they relate to development. Then Newman's principal works are considered in chronological order, with an explanation of the scope and significance of each for his theory. The second part of the work is the analysis of the psychological aspects of his doctrine just mentioned, and the third deals exhaustively with Newman's apologetics. The fourth and final part is devoted to a searchingly critical assessment of the doctrine. As if all this were not enough, there are six excellent appendices, nearly seventy pages in length, which discuss

the biographies of Newman, his personality, his philosophy of conscience, and other important matters.

Having said this much, the reviewer must go on and declare plainly that this book is an enormously impressive achievement and certainly the most valuable single volume on Newman that he has read. It is written by one who knows his subject very well indeed, for Father Walgrave wrote his dissertation on the *Grammar of Assent,* his doctoral thesis on the development of Newman's thought, and began publishing writings on Newman more than twenty years ago. Now professor of theology and philosophy at l'Institut Supérieur des Sciences Religieuses of the University of Louvain, he has recently published another book on the great Cardinal, called *Newman Vandaag.* We can well hope for a translation of this one, too, if it is anything like the volume under review. Not only does the author know his subject, he knows how to deal with it exhaustively without exhausting his readers. *Enfin,* this reviewer is pleased, if somewhat surprised, to find himself in complete agreement with the publisher's blurb about Father Walgrave's "keen critical insight, his judicial assessment of the failings as well as the successes of Newman's works, his manner, scholarly but never over-erudite", etc., which have worked together to produce a "book that is in every way worthy of its object".

James A. Carpenter.

St Timothy's Church,
Alexandria, Louisiana.

In Defense of Reason. By Yvor Winters. Routledge. 1960. 42s.

For men and women who take their faith seriously a clear understanding of how what is called imaginative literature is related to morality and religion is obviously of advantage. Since Arnold and Newman, however, few if any literary critics as much as attempt to deal with the question. The very vagueness and indeterminacy of much religious profession nowadays disguises the importance of the effect which literature can have in shaping our beliefs. Of American Episcopalians, for instance, one writer has remarked that the "Episcopal Church is so constituted that its members can really believe anything; but of course almost none of them do". I find the observation quoted by Mr Yvor Winters, a critic who recoils from the predominant relativism. He not only believes in God; he is equally positive that his belief is indispensable to his evaluation of poems, prose fictions, and dramas.

Mr Winters is professor of English at Stanford University in California, and although he sets the literature he scrutinizes in a perspective as widely English as could be asked, with in addition reference to the French Symbolists where needful, that literature is exclusively American. That should not make him any the less instructive and stimulating to Europeans. The eminent figures evoked in his pages are all figures known to us—Emerson, Hawthorne, Melville, Poe, Henry Adams, Henry James, Ezra Pound, and T. S. Eliot,

the latter being commonly regarded in the land of his birth as one of its unshared glories. With that exception, we shall be inclined to listen objectively to the voice of judgment that issues from these pages, and our objectivity can only facilitate our apprehension of the critical standards being applied.

I should mention perhaps that I have never met Prof. Winters, but I am predisposed to him. Thirty years ago I discovered him naming me in a survey of the critical scene which he put into light verse. The names he could include were naturally limited in number. In spite of this claim on my attention, he has been for long outside my purview. He was bringing out books—successively *Primitivism and Decadence* in 1937, *Maule's Curse* in 1938, and *The Anatomy of Nonsense* in 1943—and I failed to hear of them. Till now, indeed, the books did not, it seems, get published over here. Now at last all three are brought together under one cover, and with them in addition is a careful consideration of Hart Crane's poem, *The Bridge*. In other words, *In Defense of Reason* is a substantial volume. It is also a work of substance.

Its author's contrast of Emerson with the nineteenth-century New Englander, Jones Very, is as good an indication as any of how he judges. Unquestionably Emerson remains a name on both sides of the Atlantic, but who now dreams of reading him? Anybody who did—I confess that in my youth I once struggled with *English Traits*—would find, according to Prof. Winters, that Emerson "could not think clearly and coherently", and that "at the core" he "is a fraud and a sentimentalist". Where, then, lay the one-time magic of words like "Concord" and "transcendentalism"? Winters says that it resided in Emerson's use of the language of the Calvinist pulpit. "He was able to present the anarchic and anti-moral doctrines of European romanticism in a language which for two hundred years had been capable of arousing the most intense and the most obscure emotions of the American people."

Upon Jones Very (1813–80), whose *Poems and Essays* were last published in Boston in 1886, the fierce light of notoriety may seem by comparison never to have beat, but whatever quality he had is of a kind impervious to time. He used language appropriate to his faith; he was a simple if dogmatic Christian. Prof. Winters places his best poems on an equality with the poems of Blake, Traherne, and George Herbert, and reproduces in full more than a dozen of them for the reader to judge. A fact which he admits, that he does not agree with Very's theology, he treats as immaterial. Emerson's language is borrowed; Very's is his own. That is what settles the matter.

The studies of Hawthorne and Melville I must only recommend. That of Poe ignores, I would say, the obligation laid upon Poe's critic to take account of the strange glamour of Poe's verse, a glamour admittedly exerted more in Europe (and particularly in France) than in America. For the indictments of Henry Adams, Eliot, and Pound, Winters finds his grounds in Aquinas and in Occam. The indictments are of one pattern; for Eliot and Pound are held to have applied a false dictum coined by Adams—"Art had

to be confused in order to express confusion"—i.e. the confusion of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Winters is less fair to Eliot than to Henry James. For Eliot's alleged weaknesses he finds little compensation; for those he detects in James he gives an almost equal list of virtues. But *In Defense of Reason* is nevertheless a rich and rewarding contribution to criticism. It might be thought that in remote California its author was on the periphery of the West; yet in spirit he reaches into the heart of its tradition.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

PETERBOROUGH.

SHORTER NOTICES

TOWARDS MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING. By John D. Rayner. James Clarke. 1960. 4s. 6d.

Towards Mutual Understanding is a most readable and helpful booklet. Indeed, John Rayner is to be congratulated for stating in such concise and clear terms what Judaism claims on its own behalf and how Christianity appears from that standpoint. The most crucial differences between the two faiths are thrown into open relief. There is here no question of an easy agreement but rather a call to mutual respect, sympathetic understanding, and serious theological dialogue which could lead to the enrichment of both faiths.

PETER SCHNEIDER.

THE MIND OF JESUS. By William Barclay. S.C.M. Press. 1960. 5s.

STUDIES IN THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. Vol. 2. By D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones. I.V.F. 1960. 15s.

IN WHAT SENSE IS THE BIBLE INSPIRED? By J. Burnaby. National Society and S.P.C.K. 1960. 1s. 6d.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE. By B. C. Butler. Darton, Longman and Todd. 1960. 8s. 6d.

Dr Barclay's *The Mind of Jesus*, second in a new series of S.C.M. paper-backs, is an excellent five shillings' worth of 190 pages on the ministry and teaching of Jesus as far as the Transfiguration. Two further volumes by the same author will complete the story. The first and second chapters might suggest that we are to be presented with an old-fashioned life of Christ like that of J. Paterson Smyth. This is not so. No attempt is made to write a detailed life of Christ but merely to outline his words and works under such headings as "What Jesus said about God" and "The Self-chosen Title of Jesus". Each chapter is very much a unit, the result of the book's origin in articles written for the *British Weekly*. Some will criticize the volume for its conservatism and demand to know why Bultmann is never mentioned. Admittedly some of the authorities used are a little old, and one is surprised to see no reference to C. H. Dodd, V. Taylor, and the Mansons, though Jeremias gets a mention. Ques-

tions of form and source criticism are not discussed. Does Barclay believe in Deutero-Isaiah (cp. pp. 28, 118) or Q? It is regrettable that the initials of authors referred to are frequently omitted (e.g. pp. 18, 48), that works quoted are often not titled (e.g. pp. 33, 112), page references of quotations are repeatedly neglected (e.g. pp. 77, 82), and that there is no index. One or two places show signs of rushed writing, as on p. 149, where most of the material is taken from E. F. Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, pp. 196 f., and not simply paragraph (*b*). In his preface (p. 7) the author says he will leave the Fourth Gospel out of account, but he does not adhere to this decision (e.g. pp. 14, 20, 70, 103), and so gets himself involved in explaining, in the chapter on the miracles, the raising of Lazarus (pp. 92 f.), though his explanation, like that of the coin in the fish's mouth (pp. 90 f.), is not very convincing. There are misprints on pp. 45, 55, 143, 152, 189. "Undiscourageability" on p. 72 is an ugly word. Still these are only minor criticisms of what is a very useful book, deserving a wide circulation.

Dr Lloyd-Jones's second volume of *Studies in the Sermon on the Mount* contains thirty sermons, expounding, generally in a very sane way, Matthew 6 and 7, originally delivered in Westminster Chapel. Much that was said in my review of the first volume in Theology, Vol. LXII, No. 474, December 1959, pp. 524 f., applies also here. On the whole it is a very good book. Lloyd-Jones remarks on p. 330, "You can read or hear sermons that seem to be nothing but a series of quotations from various writings." This criticism certainly does not apply to this volume. There is little visible indebtedness to other expositors; the sermons are very much the fruit of the author's careful and prayerful study of the Bible. He sometimes comes down on the side of the textual critics (e.g. p. 77) and frequently prefers the R.V. to the A.V. There are many really excellent passages, which compensate for the few naive (e.g. p. 155), old-fashioned (e.g. p. 235) or prejudiced (e.g. p. 247) paragraphs. After reading these sermons an Anglican is forced to ask where in the Church of England could one listen to such a series of sermons, each lasting half an hour or so, expounding lengthy "chunks" of scripture? *Ecclesia Anglicana* is rapidly reaching a position where the five-minute parish communion address is sufficient each Sunday. One can learn much from Dr Lloyd-Jones.

Prof. Burnaby is becoming quite an authority on the inspiration of the Bible. His book *Is the Bible Inspired?*, published originally in 1949, has recently been re-issued by the S.P.C.K. as a Seraph Book. He has also contributed to the symposium *On the Authority of the Bible*. Now he has produced a pamphlet of twenty pages, entitled *In What Sense is the Bible Inspired?*, which could, perhaps, not inaccurately, be described as a revised summary of his *Is the Bible Inspired?* It is No. 7 in the series Questions at Issue brought out by the National Society and the S.P.C.K., with sixth-formers and the intelligent layman in mind. Prof. Burnaby has covered a great deal of ground. Some will perhaps find the pamphlet too condensed, and they are advised to move on to the larger volume. There is an inter-

esting reference to the Eastern Church on p. 6, indicating that that communion is at one with Rome on the question of the inerrancy of the Bible. One would like more information on this subject. The Eastern Church is so often left out of account in the discussion of the inspiration of the Bible.

The Abbot of Downside's *The Church and the Bible* embodies his Laureston Lectures for 1958. Like Burnaby's pamphlet, it is an attempt to reinterpret the traditional doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible for the present day. Few outside the Roman camp will prefer Butler's reinterpretation to that of Burnaby. This book, however, is important as an indication that things are changing in the Church of Rome. A number of the theories of the higher critics are at last being accepted, at any rate in scholarly circles. Thus Abbot Butler admits that much of the Mosaic legislation does not go back to Moses (p. 17, footnote), that Genesis 1 and 2 are not giving us science or history (pp. 56 f.), that, possibly, Luke has combined two different episodes in his story of the Council at Jerusalem (p. 61). It is interesting to be informed by Butler that one bold Roman Catholic writer has cast doubt on the historicity of Matthew 16. 18 (see p. 23, footnote). Those who have not yet woken up to the fact that this sort of thing is going on in the Church of Rome are strongly advised to read this book. For the moment, at any rate, it seems that the Vatican Council of 1870, Pope Leo XIII's encyclical of 1893 and Pope Pius XII's encyclical of 1950 are as much as dead-letter as the Thirty-Nine Articles in the Church of England. Will the Pope continue to allow this? Let us hope so.[1] Butler's attempt to deal with the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible in chapter two (see, also, especially p. 79) will undoubtedly be greeted with enthusiasm as a step in the right direction. Had this book been written by a non-Roman it would have excited little interest; but in view of the communion to which its author belongs, it merits a wide reading. It is a pity, therefore, that it is written in a somewhat difficult and awkward style.

Alan M. G. Stephenson.

The Theological College,
Lichfield.

The Early Christian Fathers. By F. L. Cross. Gerald Duckworth and Co. 1960. 15s.

This book attempts to do for the Fathers what Oesterley and Robinson's *Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament* attempted in its field. It covers the whole of the ante-Nicene period. None of the obvious names seem to be missing and there are a good many obscurer ones included—Quadratus and Miltiades are amongst the Apologists, as well as Aristides and Athenagoras.

[1] See, however, B. C. Butler, Roman Catholic Biblical Scholarship in *Expository Times*, Vol. LXXII, No. 4, January 1961, p. 114, "There is perhaps a danger, now, that liberty will degenerate into licence and provoke a fresh, hostile reaction at Rome."

Perhaps the best way of showing what the book is like is to describe one particular section of it—that on Hippolytus. At the head of it, as of every section, is the bibliography (and it is up to date enough to include Hannsens' work published in 1959). There follows a description of the difficulties inherent in any study of Hippolytus, together with an account of recent discoveries and hypotheses. Then comes a brief but balanced reconstruction of Hippolytus's history and then, the most important part, a summary of Hippolytus's writings with an account of the form in which each has reached us. *Apostolic Tradition* has a separate section to itself.

For anyone who needs bibliographies or lists of sources covering the period a more convenient yet comprehensive handbook would be hard to find—or a better fifteen shillings' worth. Prof. Cross has again placed us in considerable debt to his scholarship and diligence.

PETER HINCHLIFF.

RHODES UNIVERSITY,
GRAHAMSTOWN.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY. By R. H. Bainton. Van Nostrand: New York. 1960. $1.25.

THE AGE OF THE MARTYRS. By G. Ricciotti. Geoffrey Chapman. 1960. 24s.

SAINT PETER AND THE POPES. By M. Winter. Darton, Longman and Todd. 1960. 25s.

In an "Anvil" paper-back, an eminent church historian has very concisely described every aspect of the Church's life in the early centuries, with close attention to her struggles against persecution and heresy. Dr Bainton covers well-known ground, but always with a freshness of approach, and he provides many illuminating insights. He seeks reasons for the changing policies of emperors towards the Church; he examines the relationship between paganism and Christianity in the Roman Empire; he analyses the factors which enabled the Christian Church to preserve and develop Western civilization after the collapse of the empire before the barbarians.

A notable feature of the book is that as much space in it is devoted to excerpts from original sources as to the writer's own comments. These excerpts include imperial edicts, the proceedings of councils, and many passages from the Fathers, as well as from their opponents. The book has a wide scope, as it traces the development of Christian organization, discipline, and doctrine from Jewish antecedents right down to the drawing up of Justinian's code in the sixth century.

The scope of *The Age of Martyrs* is much more limited, for its aim is to examine the reigns of two emperors only, Diocletian and Constantine. The work of this other great church historian has now been translated from the Italian. It is written in a narrative style, but is a critical examination of original sources. Beginning with

Diocletian, he shows how purely political motives led that emperor to launch the final and most savage persecution which the early Church endured. A section of the book which contains much of interest is that in which he takes the contemporary accounts of martyrdoms during the great persecution, and treats them critically, sorting out the historical truth in such narratives from the pious legend. The pages which describe these martyrdoms, province by province throughout the empire, are vivid and absorbing; but the reader is not spared many gruesome details of the barbarity practised in those days.

The later part of the book is valuable as a character-study of Constantine. It traces the way in which he achieved domination over the whole of the empire, and describes his policy of fostering Christianity as the religion of the future. The legends surrounding Constantine are shrewdly treated, and the conclusion is that he was no Christian, until he received his death-bed baptism at Arian hands. Father Ricciotti takes the view that Constantine himself aggravated the strife which arose within the Church soon after the persecution ended, and that his personal interference in the Donatist and Arian disputes was a mistaken policy. He compares unfavourably the Constantinian régime with the practice of the primitive Church, which needed no emperor to call councils, exile orthodox bishops, or prefer heretical ones.

It is a matter of gratitude that this book is now available in English, for it helps us to understand a critical period in the history of the Church, and to realize that many factors combined to produce two contrasting policies of the State towards the Church in that era.

Father Ricciotti concludes by saying, of Constantine: "He considered it his duty far too often to go into the house of Peter to arrange things there." In those words, he assumes what Father Winter thoroughly argues in *St Peter and the Popes,* namely, that the primacy of the Roman see is based on the position of St Peter. Non-Roman Catholics will be interested to see this book, which the writer describes in his preface as an eirenic examination of the rise of the papal power in the period prior to Leo the Great. During Leo's pontificate, Father Winter finds the Pope enjoying as unchallenged a supremacy as any of his modern successors.

Papal history before the fourth century is poorly documented, perhaps owing to the destruction of so many records during the great persecution; many theories have therefore been put forward about the rise of the papacy. One such theory has been that the bishops of Rome merely usurped their powers; another that Rome's political superiority aided its rise as an ecclesiastical headquarters. Father Winter summarily dismisses those two theories. He takes more seriously the theory championed by Harnack, who suggested that the papal power had simply evolved historically.

In opposition to that evolutionary theory, the writer clearly states and investigates the Roman Catholic claims. He finds that the papacy is not simply an institution of government; not an office arranged for the convenience of administration; but a doctrine of

the Church, a dogma. The papacy is of the "esse" of the Church, and we read of its origin in the New Testament in the words of Christ to Peter: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church."

Father Winter finds that, beyond any doubt, the New Testament presents Peter as the leader of the apostles. The strong tradition that St Peter went to Rome is supported by a review of the archaeological evidence for the existence of the tombs of Peter and Paul in Rome. It is not denied that the papal power did not develop rapidly in the first two centuries, but matured later. This is explained by the existence of many obstacles to Christ's original plan in the early years, and the need for those obstacles to be overcome before the whole plan could emerge.

From the time of Constantine the orthodox never questioned the authority of Rome. In passing we note that the relations of Cyprian with the papacy are in a class of their own, for Cyprian showed himself in other points to be incompletely instructed. In later years, the way in which the Roman primacy affected local churches varied in different parts of the empire. But even in the East, with its more ancient and more apostolic sees, the orthodox always submitted doctrinal issues to Rome; only the heretics declined to do so. Being in communion with Rome was the test of orthodoxy.

The conclusion is that within the Church is embodied the special office of St Peter, which Christ instituted, and that this arrangement is of the unchangeable essence of the Church. Many Protestants will find interest in the book as an honest presentation of this knotty point in Roman Catholic doctrine, and a clear definition of the historical grounds for that doctrine. While they may not admire the conclusions, they will admire the scholarship of this contribution in an interesting department of early Church history.

D. H. Sansum.

Stoke Bishop,
Bristol.

Men of Unity. By Stephen Neill. S.C.M. Press. 1960. 5s.

Palestine and the Bible. By Denis Baly. World Christian Books. Lutterworth Press. 1960. 2s. 6d.

Christian books at a low price are part of world missionary strategy. The S.C.M. Press, having recently produced reprints in a paper-back edition, now start a new paper-back series with Stephen Neill's *Men of Unity*.

It is a history of the Ecumenical Movement from Edinburgh, 1910, to the present day; not an easy story to tell, for while sense of a growing urgency for unity is one of the more exciting aspects of the Church in the twentieth century, its story is liable to become a dull list of one conference after another. Bishop Neill has avoided all dullness by giving brief sketches of such people as John Mott, Bishop Azariah, William Temple, D. T. Niles, and W. A. Visser't Hooft. The result is a book full of interest; the method is seen at its weakest, however, when Pope John XXIII is introduced as a peg

on which to hang a discussion on the past and present reaction of the Church of Rome to the movement; again, while Bonhoeffer is undoubtedly one of the heroes of the Church to-day, his inclusion here seems rather out of place. But it remains an admirable introduction to the history of ecumenicity, and is particularly valuable in making clear the contributions of the younger Churches.

World Christian Books have many valuable books to their credit, all produced at a very low price indeed. One wonders, however, whether Denis Baly's *Palestine and the Bible* has not been made to suffer in order to conform to so low a price. Baly is a teacher of geography at Kenyon College, Ohio, and it would seem incredible for a professional geographer to be content with the two inadequate maps that are provided.

Archaeologists and others have made historical geography exciting and not merely a duty for the conscientious. It was an admirable idea to share some of this with those who are trying to read their Bible. Anyone who reads this book with his Bible open will find much here that comes alive as he is guided through the seasons, the life of the farmer and that of the nomad, and the buildings of Jerusalem; but he will find it very hard going to get through the first chapter, a general description of the country, unless he has much better maps to hand than are provided here. A few well-drawn charts would have done for this book what pages of description have laboured to convey.

Murray S. MacDonald.

Upwood Vicarage,
Hunts.

The Mind of the Oxford Movement. Edited and introduced by Owen Chadwick. A. and C. Black. 1960. 21s.

In a series of works on modern religious thought, the contribution of the Oxford Movement must take a prominent place. Prof. Chadwick has made in this book a representative selection from the writings of its leaders to illustrate those emphases which marked their distinctive contribution to the life and thought of Anglicanism in the 19th century. In an admirable introductory essay, he points out that, like the preceding Evangelical revival, it was a movement more of the heart than of the head—a revolt against the spiritual aridity of the Age of Reason. Ecclesiastical and secular politics (and, not least, events in Ireland) had their place in shaping the policy of its leaders. But the old High Church tradition had now become "high and dry", and an infusion of fresh life, and new ideas in prayer and worship, were needed to capture the imagination and hold the allegiance of those younger men who found the alternative of Evangelical piety aesthetically unsatisfying.

Perhaps the most significant point made is the importance of Pusey's contribution, not simply in holding the Tractarians together as a party, but because, in the long-term view, he represented the devotional forces of the Movement, which proved to be its greatest

and most effective power. The intellect of Newman and the pastoral ministry of Keble needed the devotional and mystical atmosphere of Pusey's writings to secure new disciples. In Prof. Chadwick's opinion, the "Tracts for the Times", with a few exceptions, were too slight or too obviously controversial to represent the essential thought of the Movement. The selection, therefore, includes examples of its poetry, for it was this strand which, perhaps more than any other element, comes nearest to the heart of its fundamental appeal. This anthology will be welcomed by many who seek to understand the mind of the Oxford Movement.

G. C. B. Davies.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

Jeremiah. By H. Cunliffe-Jones. Torch Bible Commentaries. S.C.M. Press. 15s.

1 and 2 Peter and Jude. By C. E. B. Cranfield. Torch Bible Commentaries. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

The Christian and his Bible. By Douglas Johnson. Inter-Varsity Fellowship. Second edition, 1960. 4s.

Dr Cunliffe-Jones's book is certainly not one to be skimmed through, but is most rewarding for all that. The sections dealing with critical problems are short, but demand a lot of work checking references if they are to make sense. But this is always in order to show how Jeremiah's original message compares and contrasts with those who edited and transmitted his book. Obedience to God is seen as Jeremiah's primary concern; there is little speculation about his views on the intrinsic validity of sacrifice or Josiah's centralizing policy. We are offered much food for thought on Jeremiah as one of God's people and yet isolated within it, but Dr Cunliffe-Jones is surely too timid when he discusses the possibilities of Jeremiah's "theocratic" view of history for to-day. The book should be an asset to both students and preachers.

Mr Cranfield's book is easier to read quickly. The introductions are confined to critical problems; they are clearly written, and concerned to present arguments on both sides rather than particular conclusions. Theological points are discussed as they arise in the notes on the text. These notes are often meditative and at times over-homiletic (e.g. on pp. 129 and 132), but some are specially helpful (e.g. on 1 Peter 1. 3 and on the social conditions behind 1 Peter 3. 1–6). The "spirits in prison" passage is seen as a "hint" that Christ's death avails for all men, whatever time they died. A more detailed exposition of 1 Peter's doctrine of the Atonement would be welcome; ". . . vicarious. He died in our place" is not adequate on 1 Peter 3. 18. On the whole, profundity is a less notable feature of this book than reverence and sound common sense.

The purpose of Mr Johnson's book is to assert the reliability rather than the verbal inerrancy of the Bible. He reminds us to "let God speak to us through it" (p. 147), but in view of his title he tends

to be concerned too much with its historicity and too little with its relevance for to-day.

C. J. Sansbury.

Portsmouth.

Calvin. By E. Stickelberger. Translated by D. G. Gelzer. James Clarke and Co. 1959. 13s. 6d.

This is an enthusiastic work of piety by an elderly Swiss novelist. It is overwritten and ill-translated. For example, "[Farel] literally devoured [the Institutes]" . . . "[Farel's] facial expression tensed; by force he gripped the hesitant Calvin, his countenance so close that he could feel his steaming breath: 'Therefore . . . let God damn your work!'" Too many people feel like that about Calvin already: this book, without intending to do so, might well confirm them in that regrettable opinion! But, if one can endure the style, there is occasionally useful information available here, not least in the notes.

The Works of Jonathan Edwards. Vol. II. A Treatise concerning the Religious Affections. Ed. J. E. Smith. Yale University Press: O.U.P. 1959. 60s.

This volume, like its predecessor, is magnificently produced and carefully edited. The editor, professor of philosophy at the University of Yale, provides over eighty pages of an Introduction which shows a profound and erudite analysis of Edwards's treatment of the question, How shall the presence of the divine Spirit be discerned against the background of the Great Awakening in New England?, and contrives to give it a contemporary relevance. If a criticism may be diffidently suggested in the presence of this careful scholarship, then I would doubt that William Perkins can be intelligibly described as "a non-separatist congregationalist" (65); and the fact that Edwards makes almost no reference to Calvin should be interpreted to mean—in spite of Prof. Smith—that Edwards was not in fact, on Calvin's terms, a Calvinist (64).

Basil Hall.

University of Cambridge.

BOOK NOTES

The S.C.M. Press has published a new paper-back edition of *The English Religious Tradition* by Norman Sykes (6s.) with an epilogue about developments since it was first published in 1953. Martin Buber's *Between Man and Man* (6s.), translated and introduced by R. Gregor Smith, is now available in Collins' Fontana Library. Faber and Faber have republished *Liturgy and Society* by A. G. Hebert as a paper-back (8s. 6d.): the first edition was reviewed in Theology, July 1935, pp. 2 f. A second volume of W. E. Sangster's *Westminster Sermons* is now available (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.). *St Francis de Sales* by M. V. Woodgate (Brown and Nolan, 12s. 6d.) is a short, popular biography. *The Children's Eucharist* by F. Barrie Flint (Mowbray, 6s.) is a series of talks on the Gospels for the Sundays after Trinity, which was previously published under the title *After Trinity*. J. C. Heenan's *They Made Me Sign*, reviewed by the present Archbishop of Dublin in Theology, December 1949, pp. 478 f., has now been brought out as a Stagbook by Sheed and Ward (4s.). S.P.C.K. has published another useful collection of recent theological

studies under the title *The Communication of the Gospel in New Testament Times* (8s. 6d.): included are "Messianic Prophecy and Preparation for Christ" by Austin Farrer, "Christology and Theology" by C. F. Evans, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery" by J. A. Emerton, "New Testament Christianity and the Hellenistic World" by F. W. Beare, "Presuppositions of the Typological Approach to Scripture" by R. A. Markus, and "The Advent and Theological Language" by F. W. Dillistone. Penguin Books have published a new translation of *The Cloud of Unknowing* by Clifton Wolters (3s. 6d.). *They Wrote our Hymns* by Hugh Martin (S.C.M. Press, 6s.) is an attractive account of some famous hymn writers of the 18th and 19th centuries. *The Ethic of Jesus in the Teaching of the Church* by John Knox (Abingdon Press, $2.00) is a small but important book which asserts the absoluteness of the Lord's ethic, criticizes familiar ways of getting round it, and maintains that the New Testament itself has a constructive answer to the problem it sets, which is *not* to be found in Paul's teaching about justification. This book should be read alongside C. H. Dodd's *Gospel and Law*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Brand Blanshard,* *Reason and Goodness* (42s.); Ian Ramsey (Ed.), *Prospect for Metaphysics* (25s.); M. I. Boas, *God, Christ and Pagan* (25s.); Louis Arnaud Reid, *Ways of Knowledge and Experience* (40s.).

ANGLICAN TRUTH SOCIETY (SYDNEY): K. C. Westwood, *God and Space* (3s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: W. H. Thorpe, *Biology, Psychology and Belief* (4s. 6d.).

CHALLONER PRESS: P. Bourgy, *Christ's Resurrection* (7s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Louis Bouyer, *The Word, Church and Sacraments* (10s. 6d.); A. M. Carré, O.P., *The Everlasting Priest* (12s. 6d.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: *The Word of God and Fundamentalism* (4s.).

DARTON, LONGMAN AND TODD: Jean Daniélou, S. J., *The Bible and the Liturgy* (42s.); Karl Rahner, S.J., *Theological Investigations*. Vol. I, *God, Christ, Mary and Grace* (63s.); G. A. Michell, *Landmarks in Liturgy* (18s.); Louis Bouyer, *The Meaning of Sacred Scripture* (35s.); G. C. Darton, *St John the Baptist and the Kingdom of Heaven* (7s. 6d.).

DROZ (GENEVA): Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum: the function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Fr. 50).

EDITIONS DU SEUIL: Jean Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le Jansénisme* (n.p.); L.-J. Rondeleux, *Isaïe et le prophétisme* (n.p.).

EPWORTH PRESS: L. D. Weatherhead, *A Plain Man Looks at the Cross* (2s. 6d.).

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY PRESS (NEW YORK): Michael Hurley, S.J., *Scriptura Sola: Wyclif and his Critics* (n.p.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Robert S. Paul, *The Atonement and the Sacraments* (30s.).

MACMILLAN (NEW YORK): H. A. Reinhold, *The Dynamics of Liturgy* (33s.).

MOWBRAYS: S. C. Clark, *Unity, Uniformity and the English Church* (7s. 6d.); R. R. Williams, *Take thou Authority* (4s.); Donet Meynell Roelofs, *A Testament of Turning* (10s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Alan Richardson, *The Bible in the Age of Science* (5s.); Anthony T. Hanson, *The Pioneer Ministry* (21s.).

SHEED AND WARD: Alexander Jones, *Unless some Man Show Me* (6s.); Leo Trese, *Vessel of Clay* (4s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Thomas Wood (Ed.), *Five Pastorals* (15s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (18s. 6d.); Malcolm A. Jeeves, *Contemporary Psychology and Christian Belief and Experience* (1s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

New Publications

The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity

N. Q. KING, Professor of Divinity in the University College of Ghana

The first full study of the Theodosian settlement in English.

Library of History and Doctrine 21s net

Anglican Devotion

C. J. STRANKS, Archdeacon of Auckland

This book takes us from the Reformation to the Oxford Movement, showing the variety but also the common tradition of the writers to whom Englishmen turned as masters in the school of prayer and Christian behaviour. 25s net

Christians and Power Politics

ALAN BOOTH, Secretary of the Churches' Commission on International Affairs

Realistic comment on the world of politics today.

A *Living Church Book* 6s net

D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence

MARTIN JARRETT-KERR

With a Foreword by Mr T. S. Eliot this book, first published in 1951, has been revised with an Introduction touching on the recent *Lady Chatterley* trial in London and is published as a considered Christian contribution to the current discussion about creative writing and the ethics of sex. 8s 6d net

The Self in Pilgrimage

New Insights into Psychology and Religion

EARL A. LOOMIS, Director of the Program in Psychiatry and Religion at Union Theological Seminary, New York

In the Foreword Dr Reinhold Niebuhr writes that the book 'will be of tremendous help to all pastors and counsellors and to the whole Christian community'.

A *Living Church Book* 6s net

SCM PRESS

Man as Churchman

NORMAN SYKES

This book prints the text of the Wiles Lectures for 1959. In them the late Dean of Winchester discusses a number of problems arising from the occasional conflict between church history and theology, such as occurred during the Reformation. 21*s. net*

English Religious Dissent

ERIK ROUTLEY

A new volume in the *English Institutions* series, showing the changing nature of dissent (and what was dissented against) from Wyclif and the early martyrs to the present-day non-Anglican churches.

18*s.* 6*d. net*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PAUL WINTER
ON THE TRIAL OF JESUS

(Studia Judaica: Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums, Band I.)

8vo., 216 pp., cloth

38s.

A fully documented study of the historical aspects

Available from

W. Heffer & Sons Ltd, Petty Cury, Cambridge